



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/523,811	03/13/2000	Fernando Incertis Carro	FR999030	6555
25259	7590	02/24/2004	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION			PAULA, CESAR B	
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.				
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195				
REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/523,811	CARRO, FERNANDO INCERTIS
Examiner	Art Unit	
CESAR B PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the preliminary amendment, and IDS filed on 3/13/2000.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-31 are pending in the case. Claims 1-6, and 8 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), and based on application # 994800712 filed in Europe on 7/29/1999, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 3/13/2000 have been approved by the draftsperson.

Specification

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

6. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: "location described" line 2.

It seems that this should read as "location described". Appropriate correction is required.

7. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: "th Greenwich meridian" line 6. It seems that this should read as "the Greenwich meridian". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the absolute longitude X", "the length", "the arc", "the terrestrial parallel", "the Greenwich meridian", "the absolute latitude Y", "the length", "the arc", "the North Pole" in lines 4-5, and 7-8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

10. Claim 16 recites the limitation “the absolute longitude X_r ”, “the length”, “the arc”, “the terrestrial parallel”, “th Greenwich meridian”, “the absolute latitude Y_r ”, “the length”, “the arc”, “the North Pole” in lines 5-6, and 8-9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

11. Claim 17 recites the limitation “the less significant digits”, “the absolute geographic coordinates”, “the specified geographic area”, in lines 5-7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. There are no previous, “less significant digits”, “absolute geographic coordinates”, “specified geographic area”, in the claim.

12. Claim 17 recites the limitation “the absolute geographic coordinates” in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. There is no previous “absolute geographic coordinates” in this claim.

13. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim recites “once for all” line 4. It is unclear as to what is meant by “once for all”, since the invention deals with the downloading and manipulation of digital data (storable data that changes) from the Internet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 1-16, 18-26, and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagai (Pat. # 6,138,072, 10/24/2000, filed on 4/22/2000), in view of “Laura Lemay’s Web Workshop Creating Commercial Web Pages”, Lemay et al, hereinafter Lemay, Sams, 1996, pp. 73-75.

Regarding independent claim 1, Nagai discloses a base station –*server*—for the retrieval of web pages related to the latitude, and longitude—*geographic locations*— of a selected location on a map displayed on a screen of a navigation device -- (col. 3, lines 37-67, fig.1, lines 21-67).

Moreover, Nagai discloses the selection of a relative position on a map on the display screen, and the conversion of the relative position on the map into an absolute position-- *determining geographic coordinates*--defined by the latitude/longitude coordinate system -- *encoding said geographic coordinates in a geographic address (gURL)* (col. 3, lines 37-67, fig.1-3, col. 6, lines 21-67).

Moreover, Nagai discloses that when a user makes a selection of the object position, a URL having the latitude and longitude of the object is transmitted for the retrieval of that object’s web page (col. 6, lines 54-67). Nagai fails to explicitly disclose: *tagging said document*

with said geographic address (gURL). However, Lemay teaches the HTML coding of links into a web page to be able to select a web page (page 73, lines 21-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a tag with the geographic coordinate, because Lemay teaches above allowing the coding of a link in a web page, so that users have the ability to navigate quickly to the web page. This provides the benefit of using a more descriptive and exact address of the object's position for the quick retrieval of the web page associated with the object using the link.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Nagai discloses that when a user makes a selection of the object position, a URL having the latitude and longitude of the object's is transmitted for the retrieval of that object's web page (col. 6, lines 54-67). Nagai fails to explicitly disclose: *tagging said document with one or a plurality of geographic attribute.* However, Lemay teaches the HTML coding of links into a web page to be able to select a web page (page 73, lines 21-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a tag with the geographic coordinate or attribute, because Lemay teaches above allowing the coding of a link to a web page, so that users have the ability to navigate quickly to the web page. This provides the benefit of using a more descriptive and exact address of the object's position for the quick retrieval of the web page associated with the object using the link.

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claims 1 or 2, Nagai discloses the accessing of a home page written in HTML over the Internet using an http protocol from a base station –*Web server* (col. 6, lines 58-67, and col. 7, lines 1-20).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claims 1 or 2, Nagai discloses the insertion and display of a switch linked to the URL of the absolute latitude/longitude coordinates—*bi-dimensional and expressed in term of longitude and latitude* (col. 6, lines 58-67, and col. 7, lines 1-20).

Claim 5 is directed towards a method for performing the steps found in claim 4, (where the latitude and longitude are well known terms of art) and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 6 is directed towards a server system for implementing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 7 is directed towards a computer-readable medium for storing instructions for performing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 8, Nagai discloses that when a user makes a selection of the object position, a URL having the latitude and longitude of the object's is transmitted for the retrieval of that object's web page (col. 6, lines 54-67). Nagai fails to explicitly disclose: *a tag including a geographic address (gURL), said geographic address*. However, Lemay teaches the

HTML coding of links into a web page to be able to select a web page (page 73, lines 21-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a tag with the geographic coordinate, because Lemay teaches above allowing the coding of a link to a web page, so that users have the ability to navigate quickly to the web page. This provides the benefit of using a more descriptive and exact address of the object's position for the quick retrieval of the web page associated with the object using the link.

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 8, Nagai discloses that when a user makes a selection of the object position, a URL having the latitude and longitude of the object's is transmitted for the retrieval of that object's web page (col. 6, lines 54-67). Nagai fails to explicitly disclose: *one or a plurality of attributes related to the geographic location described or referenced in the document*. However, Lemay teaches the HTML coding of links into a web page to be able to select a web page (page 73, lines 21-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have encoded the latitude/longitude associated with the name of certain position in the map, because Lemay teaches above allowing the coding of a link to a web page, so that users have the ability to navigate quickly to the web page. This provides the benefit of using a more descriptive and exact address of the object's position for the quick retrieval of the web page associated with the object.

Regarding claim 10, which depends on either of claims 8 to 9, Nagai discloses that when a user of a navigation device—*client*—makes a selection of the object position, a URL, using an http protocol, having the latitude and longitude of the object, is transmitted for the retrieval, from

a provider—*one of a plurality of Web servers*-- of that object's HTML web page via the Internet (col. 3, lines 1-18, col.6, lines 54-67).

Claim 11 is directed towards a method for performing the steps found in claim 4, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 12 is directed towards a document equivalent to the document found in claim 4, (where the latitude and longitude are well known terms of art) and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claims 8 or 9, Nagai discloses the selection of a relative position—*specifying a reference point*-- on a map on the display screen, and the conversion of the relative position on the map into an absolute position-- *determining geographic coordinates*--defined by the latitude/longitude coordinate system --*encoding said geographic coordinates in a geographic address (gURL)* (col. 3, lines 37-67, fig.1-3, col. 6, lines 21-67).

Moreover, Nagai discloses the insertion and display of a switch linked to the URL of the absolute latitude/longitude coordinates, which allows the selection, retrieval from a base station—*one or more servers*--, and display of a web page corresponding to the absolute coordinates (col. 7, lines 1-20, fig.2-3).

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 13, Nagai discloses that when a user makes a selection of the object position, a URL having the latitude and longitude of the object's is

transmitted for the retrieval of that object's web page. When the user activates a switch on the screen, the url is transmitted to a provider which in turn accesses—*searching on the one of the plurality of server systems*— the web page and transmits it to the user (col.3, lines 1-18, col. 6, lines 54-67, and col. 7, lines 1-36). Nagai fails to explicitly disclose: *a tag including a geographic address (gURL), said geographic address*. However, Lemay teaches the HTML coding of links into a web page to be able to select a web page (page 73, lines 21-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a tag with the geographic coordinate, because Lemay teaches above allowing the coding of a link to a web page, so that users have the ability to navigate quickly to the web page. This provides the benefit of using a more descriptive and exact address of the object's position for the quick retrieval of the web page associated with the object using the link.

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 13, Nagai discloses that when a user makes a selection of the object position, situated at an area with certain latitude and longitude—*specifying a geographic area around the reference point*—, a URL having the latitude and longitude not clearly spelled out into degrees, minutes, and seconds (“n=035642_e=1393759”—*fuzzy geographic coordinates*) of the object's is transmitted—*determining geographic coordinates*— for the retrieval of that object's web page. When the user activates a switch on the screen, the url is transmitted to a provider which in turn accesses—*searching on the one of the plurality of server systems*— the web page and transmits it to the user (col.3, lines 1-18, col. 6, lines 54-67, and col. 7, lines 1-36).

Claim 16 is directed towards a method for performing the steps found in claim 5, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 13, Nagai discloses a processing unit—*pointing device* for the positioning of a cursor on a display screen for the selection of the object's graphical representation, such as “Company X”, located at position—*reference point*-- on a map displayed on the screen (col. 6, lines 54-67, col. 7, lines 1-16, fig.2-3).

Claim 19 is directed towards a system for performing the steps found in claim 13, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 20 is directed towards a computer-readable medium for performing the steps found in claim 13, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claims 8 or 9, Nagai discloses that when a user makes a selection of the object position located in a geographical location of the display screen, a URL having the latitude and longitude of the object's is accessed—*retrieving the absolute geographic coordinates*—in association—*mapping the geographic location according to the absolute geographic coordinates*-- with the geographic coordinates for the retrieval of an object's web page (col.3, lines 1-18, col. 6, lines 54-67, and col. 7, lines 1-36). Nagai fails to explicitly disclose: *geographic address tagged on the documents*. However, Lemay teaches the HTML coding of links into a web page to be able to select a web page (page 73, lines 21-32). It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have retrieved the coordinates in a tag corresponding to the geographic coordinate, because Lemay teaches above allowing the coding of a link to a web page, so that users have the ability to navigate quickly to the web page. This provides the benefit of using a more descriptive and exact address of the object's position for the quick retrieval of the web page associated with the object using the link.

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Nagai discloses the storage of URLs—*network address*-- in association with latitude and longitude related to home pages providing objects guide information (col.2, lines 1-4, col. 7, lines 1-8, and fig.7).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 21, Nagai discloses the conversion of geographic coordinates to an absolute set of coordinates using longitude and latitude coordinate system—*defining a scale according to the absolute geographic coordinates* (col.3, lines 1-18, col. 6, lines 54-67, and col. 7, lines 1-36).

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 21, Nagai teaches that when a user makes a selection of the object graphical representation—*icon*--, such as “Company X”, located at position on a map displayed on a screen, a URL, associated with—*pointed to by*-- the object's representation, and having the latitude and longitude, and a network address—
<http://www.honda.service.cp.jp>-- of the object. After the user has selected the object's

representation, the URL is retrieved, and transmitted for the retrieval of that object's web page (col. 6, lines 54-67, fig.2-3).

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 21, Nagai teaches the display of a map on a computer screen with graphical representation of objects—*mapping*-- representing institutions, such as companies—*referencing point* (col. 3, lines 37-67, fig.2-3).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 21, Nagai discloses a processing unit—*pointing device* for the positioning of a cursor on a display screen for the selection of or *pointing to* the object's graphical representation—*icon*--, such as “Company X”, located at position on a map displayed on the screen. The user selects the object's representation for the retrieval of the object's web page (col. 6, lines 54-67, col. 7, lines 1-16, fig.2-3).

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 24, Nagai teaches the display of object graphical representations—*icons*--, such as “Company X”, located at position on a map displayed on a screen, and which are displayed on the same scale as the map, and displayed in reference to the same reference point, such as road “16” (col. 2, lines 57-67, fig.2-3).

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 21, Nagai teaches the display of object graphical representations at position on a map displayed on a screen (col. 2, lines 57-67, fig.2-3). Nagai fails to explicitly disclose: *retrieving a geographic map from one or a plurality of server systems*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to have retrieved the map from one or more server systems, because Nagai teaches the benefit of easily obtaining guide information on objects displayed on the map (col.1, lines 63-67).

Claim 30 is directed towards a system for performing the steps found in claim 21, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 31 is directed towards a computer-readable medium for performing the steps found in claim 21, and therefore is similarly rejected.

16. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagai, in view of Lemay, and further in view of Brunts et al, hereinafter Brunts (Pat. # 5,774,828, 6/30/1998).

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 21, Nagai discloses a processing unit—*pointing device* for the positioning of a cursor on a display screen for the selection of or *pointing to* a object's switch “SW” graphical representation—*icon*— located at position on a map displayed on the screen. The user selects the switch for the retrieval of the object's web page (col. 7, lines 10-44, fig.3). Nagai fails to explicitly disclose *minimum information comprising in particular: a title or name of the geographic location; a short description of the geographic location; geographic coordinates of said geographic location; distance from the reference point to said geographic location*. However, Brunts teaches the display of restaurant names, category and subcategory of the restaurants, latitude and longitude of these restaurants, and the distance to a

selected location, in this case the restaurants (col. 3, lines 5-8, col. 11, lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have retrieved the minimum information above corresponding to the geographic coordinate, and have combined Nagai, Lemay, and Brunts, because Brunts teaches the benefit of displaying destination information in a manner affordable to many users, and a programmable navigation system to be utilized in automotive systems (col. 2, lines 33-47).

Allowable Subject Matter

19. Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kambe et al. (Pat. # 6,487,305 B2), Takayama et al (Pat. # 6,336,072 B1), Ando (Pat. # 6,202,022 B1), Hancock et al. (Pat. # 6,202,023 B1), Ishikawa et al. (Pat. # 6,650,647 B1), and Hirono (Pat. # 6,263,343 B1).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- **(703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



Cesar B Paula
CESAR B PAULA
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

2/23/04